

OVERPROGRAMING FOR AIR FORCE  
DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

---

EIGHTEENTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS



JUNE 27, 1952.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

---

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1952



## COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Illinois, *Chairman*

CHET HOLIFIELD, California  
HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia  
PORTER HARDY, Jr., Virginia  
FRANK M. KARSTEN, Missouri  
JOHN W. McCORMACK, Massachusetts  
HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina  
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota  
HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts  
M. G. BURNSIDE, West Virginia  
RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri  
JOHN F. SHELLEY, California  
W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina  
SIDNEY A. FINE, New York  
WILLIAM C. LANTAFF, Florida  
WALTER S. BARING, Nevada

CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Michigan  
R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York  
CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana  
GEORGE H. BENDER, Ohio  
CHARLES B. BROWNSON, Indiana  
THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri  
MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Illinois  
GEORGE MEADER, Michigan  
WILLIAM E. McVEY, Illinois  
ALVIN R. BUSH, Pennsylvania  
FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr., New Jersey

CHRISTINE RAY DAVIS, *Chief Clerk*  
THOMAS A. KENNEDY, *General Counsel*  
WILLIAM A. YOUNG, *Staff Director*

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

PORTER HARDY, Jr., Virginia, *Chairman*

RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri  
JOHN F. SHELLEY, California  
WILLIAM C. LANTAFF, Florida  
WALTER S. BARING, Nevada

R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York  
GEORGE H. BENDER, Ohio  
GEORGE MEADER, Michigan

MICHAEL P. BALWAN, *Staff Director*  
WILLIAM A. BREWER, *Counsel*  
LEWIS J. LAPHAM, *Administrative Assistant*  
JOHN O. VICK, *Administrative Assistant*



LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, D. C., June 25, 1952.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By direction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I submit herewith the eighteenth intermediate report of its subcommittee.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,  
*Chairman.*



LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Hon. C. C. Johnson  
U. S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. Jan. 23, 1912.

Dear Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th inst. in relation to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which would give the President the right to remove and appoint judges of the Supreme Court and of the inferior courts.

Very respectfully,  
Wm. H. Taft, President.



# Union Calendar No. 729

82D CONGRESS  
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT  
No. 2331

## OVERPROGRAMING FOR AIR FORCE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

JUNE 27, 1952.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DAWSON, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted the following

### EIGHTEENTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT

On June 27, 1952, the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments unanimously agreed to the report of the Government Operations Subcommittee on overprograming for Air Force dormitory construction.

The chairman was directed to transmit a copy to the Speaker of the House.

#### INTRODUCTION

The subcommittee has found that over \$80 million of programed expenditures for Air Force troop housing is unnecessary. This finding resulted from a base-by-base analysis of 105 major Air Force bases, using figures furnished by the Air Force. In testimony at a hearing the Air Force has acknowledged the accuracy of the subcommittee's analysis and has already initiated action to correct deficiencies in policies and procedures on housing its airmen which would have resulted in building more dormitories than it needs. Simply stated, this would amount to excess building of more than 200 three-story dormitories costing \$400,000 each.

The subject of airmen's housing formed a major part of the study of construction at Andrews Air Force Base on which this subcommittee reported to the Congress March 20, 1952 (H. Rept. 1623, 82d Cong.). In the report on Andrews the Air Force was found to be planning new dormitories to replace serviceable buildings which had been recently rehabilitated at considerable expense. The Air Force has now advised us that since our earlier report it has strengthened this aspect of its policy. It has applied this revised policy to other bases with a saving of \$13,199,000 worth of barracks planned to be built. Following that report, the subcommittee expanded its inquiry to a consideration of over-all Air Force housing in continental United States.



## 2 OVERPROGRAMING FOR AIR FORCE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

### BASIS OF THIS REPORT

#### *Air Force method of computing dormitory requirements*

The Air Force policy was to build dormitories for 80 percent of its airmen, on the theory that 20 percent of the men have dependents and will live in homes either on or off the base. At bases where the Air Force estimates that homes for these married airmen would not be available either on the base or in the community, it planned to build dormitory spaces for these men also. A low estimate of the number of houses available in the community (an uncertain and variable factor) results in a higher requirement for dormitory spaces on the base.

#### *Percentage of married airmen*

Studies prepared by the Air Force show that 32.2 percent of all airmen are married. Exclusive of the Air Training Command, 30.1 percent live with their dependents.

#### *Excess spaces*

The analysis showed that about 30 percent of the buildings for airmen's housing which the Air Force plans to construct would not be needed in the foreseeable future. At a simple 80 percent of troop strength, 21.3 percent of the buildings are excess; on the basis of family housing needs reported by the Air Force to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, 29.7 percent of the buildings are excess; on the basis of current experience in family housing, 33.4 percent of the buildings are excess.

Two factors inflated the Air Force's estimates of dormitory requirements as presented to the Congress.

(1) The estimate of houses available in the communities at each base were grossly underestimated. For example:

	Airmen actually living in the community as of Jan. 31, 1952	Air Force estimates of homes available in the community
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla. ....	1,835	0
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex. ....	1,643	0
Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak. ....	1,047	100
Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif. ....	1,925	200
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash. ....	1,407	300

The Air Force is also promoting a program of family housing construction by private agencies. This is done through a finding that an area is a critical area and developing with the Housing and Home Finance Agency relaxed credit and mortgage insurance commitments as a means to induce construction. The effect of this coupled with the dormitory construction would be to provide dormitories and private houses for the same airmen.

(2) The second factor concerns the percentage of airmen for whom dormitory spaces are programed. Although 30 percent of the airmen live off base with dependents, the Air Force policy was to build dormitories to accommodate at least 80 percent of its enlisted strength. This had the effect of providing rooms for at least 10 percent of the airmen who obviously will not occupy the space. The explanation offered the subcommittee for this wasteful program was that prior to



Korea only the higher ranks of married enlisted men, approximately 20 percent, were allowed to live off base. Those airmen in the lower ranks who married were not allowed to reenlist. After Korea Congress granted quarters allowance to the lower ranks of enlisted men with dependents. These men now, in the main, also live off base. The Air Force has taken the position that at some time in the future it will be able to return to its old policy and require that these airmen, about 10 percent of its strength, live on the base. Consequently the Air Force was building, or was planning to build, the extra dormitories on the supposition that they might be needed in the future, and even this supposition was predicated on congressional action.

This future need for additional dormitories will not spring up overnight. If it should ever arise, the present allowance of 72 square feet per man provides an ample cushion, while new construction is planned and speeded to meet the needs. All of the additional 10 percent now living off the bases could be housed in dormitories on the bases by temporarily reducing individual space allowances to 63 square feet, well above the minimum space allowance established by the Secretary of Defense.

Based on a space allowance of 72 square feet per man, it is estimated that there is a surplus of 25,808 spaces in the 1952 program, about \$51,616,000, and a surplus in the bill now before Congress of 16,051 spaces, about \$32,102,000. (A list of the bases where excess dormitories would have been built by 1955, and the approximate cost, will be found appended to this report.)

#### CONCLUSIONS

The Air Force has already secured in its 1952 appropriation more than \$50,000,000 which it does not need, and has been authorized by the House for its 1953 program over \$30,000,000 which it does not need. The appropriation for this latter authorization is about to be considered by the House. These excesses were caused by using faulty estimates of housing dormitories for men who would not live on the base.

Following our first hearing and prior to the hearing held on June 26, 1952, the Air Force changed its policy. Dormitories will now be built to house only 70 percent of the enlisted strength to conform to conditions as they actually exist. Assurances have been provided that action to correct other deficiencies in policies and procedures with respect to airmen's housing have now been initiated by the Air Force. These corrections should include quick and decisive action not only to eliminate future contracts for excess dormitories but to cancel contracts for such dormitories which have been already awarded.

The committee has not had an opportunity to study the wisdom of requiring a rescission of the more than \$50,000,000 of excess appropriation provided for fiscal 1952 and recommends to the Appropriations Committee a close scrutiny of this subject.

With respect to the appropriation for fiscal 1953, the committee is not yet advised as to the amount requested of or allowed by the Appropriations Committee. If the full amount has been included in the bill to be considered by the House, an amendment should be offered to reduce the appropriation for dormitory construction by at least \$30,000,000.



#### 4 OVERPROGRAMING FOR AIR FORCE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

The Air Force is a young organization and has had limited experience in coping with the tremendous administrative responsibilities involved in its operations. Competent leadership is required to correct its inefficiencies. The committee is grateful particularly to Assistant Secretary Edwin V. Huggins for his cooperative attitude and for his manifest determination to make improvements. It is unfortunate that a congressional committee had to point out the deficiencies herein discussed, but it is gratifying that Secretary Huggins has taken prompt corrective action. We believe that he has a consciousness of the necessity for economy in the operations of the Air Force. He has assured us that faulty policies have been corrected and that he will seek to eliminate ineptitude in effectuating those policies.

When added together, the unnecessary programed expenditures discussed in this report aggregate nearly \$100,000,000. It is gratifying to have assurances from the Air Force Assistant Secretary that he will not permit the construction of barracks which are destined to stand empty.

Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, La.....	\$1, 314, 000
Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.....	574, 000
Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Okla.....	412, 000
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.....	1, 440, 000
Camp Beale Air Force Base, Camp Beale, Calif.....	2, 154, 000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.....	492, 000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.....	776, 000
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.....	822, 000
Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex.....	612, 000
Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.....	214, 000
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.....	1, 380, 000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.....	1, 082, 000
Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C.....	820, 000
Clinton Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.....	1, 468, 000
James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.....	1, 070, 000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.....	1, 028, 000
Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.....	1, 328, 000
Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.....	1, 914, 000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc Lake, Calif.....	1, 842, 000
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.....	3, 594, 000
Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colo.....	604, 000
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.....	1, 112, 000
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.....	2, 860, 000
Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex.....	398, 000
Galveston Air Force Base, Galveston, Tex.....	566, 000
Grandview Air Force Base, Grandview, Mo.....	674, 000
Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.....	434, 000
Gunter Air Force Base, Gunter, Ala.....	354, 000
Hanscom Air Force Base, Bedford, Mass.....	1, 122, 000
Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex.....	1, 404, 000
Holoman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.....	698, 000
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.....	1, 556, 000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.....	11, 488, 000
Kinross Air Force Base, Kinross, Mich.....	528, 000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.....	2, 568, 000
Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.....	2, 652, 000
Lakeland Air Force Base, Lakeland, Fla.....	818, 000
Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.....	1, 754, 000
Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex.....	698, 000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.....	1, 540, 000
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.....	754, 000
Lawson Air Force Base, Columbus, Ga.....	690, 000
Limestone Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine.....	1, 878, 000
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.....	2, 700, 000



## OVERPROGRAMING FOR AIR FORCE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION 5

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio	\$2, 412, 000
March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif	2, 018, 000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif	856, 000
McGuire Air Force Base, McGuire, N. J	734, 000
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho	4, 332, 000
New Castle Air Force Base, New Castle, Del	650, 000
Niagara Falls Air Force Base, Niagara Falls, N. Y	290, 000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr	666, 000
O'Hare Air Force Base, O'Hare, Ill	302, 000
Paine Air Force Base, Paine, Wash	366, 000
Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Fla	2, 320, 000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla	548, 000
Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, N. Y	498, 000
Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, N. C	2, 496, 000
Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H	2, 276, 000
Raleigh-Durham Air Force Base, Raleigh, N. C	390, 000
Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak	710, 000
Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex	574, 000
Sedalia Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo	1, 396, 000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Selfridge, Mich	588, 000
Selman Air Force Base, Monroe, La	1, 310, 000
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C	560, 000
Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans	4, 328, 000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev	232, 000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Suffolk County, N. Y	1, 016, 000
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif	1, 802, 000
Truax Air Force Base, Truax, Wis	370, 000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex	778, 000
Wichita Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans	618, 000
Camp Wolters Air Force Base, Camp Wolters, Tex	1, 700, 000